



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,248	10/19/2000	Mitsuteru Kataoka	2000 1450A	5018

7590 01/27/2006

WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

REILLY, SEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been assigned to another Examiner.

This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration filed on October 24, 2005. Claims 15, 17-22, 24-29 and 31-37 are presented for further examination. All independent claims have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 4, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 15, 17-18, 21-22, 24-25, 28-29, 31-32, and 35-37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609, hereinafter "Katinsky").

In considering claim 15, Katinsky discloses a storage-based broadcasting system (i.e. web server that serves web pages across the Internet) for supplying a plurality of services to a requesting client terminal, each of the plurality of user interfaces being respectively unique to one of the plurality of services (i.e. where a service may be one of news or sports for instance and the interface is unique since the content of the service is in and of itself unique, Col 4, lines 37-49), which are each composed of content stored in said system (i.e. supplying an webpage-embedded multimedia player to present multimedia content, see Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-25), said system comprising:

Transmission means for transmitting a browser (media access web page 10), in a non-executable data format, as part of the content (i.e. the embedded multimedia player constitutes “control content,” which is sent via a wire or radio wave which are both non-executable formats), the control content being transmitted by said transmission means so as to generate the user interface (i.e. the computer code that constitutes the multimedia player is transmitted and is used to generate the viewable player interface); and

Receiving means for receiving and activating the transmitted control content so as to execute the one of the plurality of user interfaces (i.e. the computer code is received and is executed by a browser to display the player), wherein one of the user interface is transmitted by said transmission means as the browser and received by said receiving means as at least part of the content while one of the plurality of services to which to one of the plurality of user interfaces is unique is transmitted as the remaining part of the content (i.e. the multimedia player is the control content and it is transmitted to the client as part of the web page content). See Fig.

Art Unit: 2153

1, col. 4, lines 6-25; col. 10, lines 17-25, describing the web page interface and sending the web page interface from a server to a client.

Wherein each browser received by said receiving means is automatically installed on the requesting client terminal so as to execute one of the plurality of user interfaces for uniquely presenting a respective one of the plurality of services without requiring a user of the client terminals to separately obtain and determine a browser respectively corresponding to the one of the plurality of services (i.e. when the user requests the webpage containing the multimedia player and content the system automatically displays the multimedia player page along with the content without user intervention);

Wherein each one of the plurality of services is uniquely presented by one of the plurality of user interfaces (i.e.. where a service may be one of news or sports for instance and the interface is unique since the content of the service is in and of itself unique, Col 4, lines 37-49).

In considering claim 17, Katinsky further discloses that the transmission means comprises:

Content pitching (i.e. sending) means for sending the content including the control content (inherent in a server that sends a web page to a client);

Service property information transmitting means for transmitting property information for indicating properties of the service (e.g. marking the information news or sports, see inter alia Figure 2b and Col 8, lines 33-41); and

Wherein the receiving means receives the transmitted property information and determines, based on the content and the service property information, the control content from

Art Unit: 2153

among the received content (i.e. the client receives the news content along with the display information and necessarily determines the two contents to display the information to the user; Col 8, lines 33-41).

In considering claim 18, Katinsky further discloses the content sending means adds to the content a content header for defining the content (inherent in order to send the content from the client to the server), and the receiving content uses the header to determine the control content from the rest of the received content (also inherent, since the client must read the header to process the information).

In considering claim 21, Katinsky further discloses that the content sending means comprises content ID space management means for sending information for defining a part of an ID space of the content, and the receiving means comprises designation means for designating the control content based on a content ID included in the defined part of the ID space (e.g. marking the information news or sports, see inter alia Figure 2b and Col 8, lines 33-41).

In considering claims 22, 24-25, and 28, claims 22, 24-25, and 28 present a method for performing the same steps described in claims 15, 17-18, and 21 respectively. Therefore, claims 22, 24-25, and 28 are rejected for the same reasons stated with regard to claims 15, 17-18, and 21 respectively.

In considering claims 29, 31-32 and 35, claims 29, 31-32 and 35 present equivalent limitations as claims 15, 17-18, and 21, and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claim 36, Katinsky further discloses a delivery unit to receive the content by the transmission unit and to transmit the content to the receiving unit (i.e. the network inherently includes intermediate devices that receive the server content and transmit it along a route to the receiving unit).

In considering claim 37, Katinsky further discloses that the content is transmitted as a digital bit stream to the delivery unit, which transmits the content as a digital bit stream to the receiving unit (i.e. messages sent across the Internet are inherently sent as digital bit streams).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 19-20, 26-27, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky, in view of Herz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,087, hereinafter "Herz").

In considering claims 19, 26, and 33 (which describe a system and method for performing the same steps), although the system taught by Katinsky discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose the use of public keys and electronic signatures in conjunction with the control content, as claimed. Nonetheless, the use of public keys and

Art Unit: 2153

electronic signatures in combination with control content, in systems that supply customized news and other information to users across the Internet, is well known, as evidenced by Herz (see Abstract and cols. 37-40, describing a detailed security system for controlling access to server information in a user-customized web page system). Thus, given the teaching of Herz, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a public key and electronic signatures with the system taught by Katinsky, so that users can maintain their own profiles without the threat of others hacking into the system and maliciously stealing user information or changing user settings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the claimed public key and electronic signature features, as taught by Herz, in the system taught by Katinsky.

In considering claims 20, 27, and 34, Herz further discloses that the key used for authentication of the electronic signature is unique to the service (Abstract, cols. 37-40, wherein the signature and public key are unique to a user's target profile).

Response to Arguments

4. In response to Applicant's request for reconsideration filed on October 24, 2005, the following factual arguments are noted:

- a. Durham does not disclose or suggest that a browser is transmitted and received as part of the content.

- b. Katinsky does not suggest a plurality of user interfaces are supplied to a requesting client terminal to present a plurality of services, where each of the plurality of user interfaces are respectfully unique to one of the plurality of services.
- c. Katinsky does not suggest transmitting the browser as part of the content and automatically executing a browser without the client terminal having to separately obtain and determine a browser respectively corresponding to the one of the plurality of services.

In considering (a), Examiner agrees with Applicant's argument. Accordingly the Durham reference is not relied upon in the rejection set forth above.

In considering (b), Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. Applicant asserts that Katinsky does not suggest a plurality of user interfaces are supplied to a requesting client terminal to present a plurality of services, where each of the plurality of user interfaces is respectfully unique to one of the plurality of services. Applicant supports this assertion by stating that in Katinsky's system "all the different types of services that are presentable to a user of the client terminal are each displayed in the same "browser" i.e., the media access web page 10" (Applicant response pg 15 ¶ 1) or "in other words, Katinsky et al. does not disclose or suggest transmitting a different media access web page 10 which is respectfully unique to one of the plurality of services such as streaming audio or video, news, sports scores and/or movie listings" (Applicant response pg 16 ¶ 2). Examiner respectfully disagrees with this logic. First, Applicant never claims sending a *different or unique browser*, so

Art Unit: 2153

whether or not Katinsky does so is moot. Applicant merely claims sending *a* browser. Second, Katinsky clearly disclosed a plurality of user interfaces are supplied to a requesting client terminal to present a plurality of services, where each of the plurality of user interfaces is respectfully unique to one of the plurality of services. For instance, each interface is unique to each service since the content of the service is in and of itself unique, Col 4, lines 37-49.

In considering (c), Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. Applicant asserts that Katinsky does not suggest transmitting the browser as part of the content. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Katinsky system the multimedia player is transmitted to the client as part of the web page content. See Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-25; col. 10, lines 17-25, describing the web page interface and sending the web page interface from a server to a client. Thus, Katinsky clearly disclosed transmitting the browser as part of the content. Applicant also asserts that Katinsky's system does not automatically execute a browser without the client terminal to having to separately obtain and determine a browser respectively corresponding to the one of the plurality of services. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Katinsky's system when the user requests content the server transmits the appropriate media access page 10 (browser) along with the requested content for the user system to automatically display without user intervention.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, in PTO-892 form, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Reilly whose telephone number is 571-272-4228. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2153

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 18, 2006



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner